

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16, 17 and 19-24 are rejected. Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 18 and 25-28 are objected to. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 11, 19, 20, 23 and 26 have been amended. New Claims 29-44 have been added for examination. The specification and drawings stand as filed.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The basis for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification, Claims and Drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McNaughton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,086,118).

Applicants have amended Claim 19 to note that the spring clip is positioned within an aperture transversely extending through the housing. Applicants respectfully submit that McNaughton does not disclose a connector as defined by amended claim 19. In McNaughton, the end of the housing that extends into the interior chamber is retained in the bore by a c-shaped spring clip. The spring clip wraps around the housing, only engaging a notch on the outside of the housing in addition to the wall of the bore. Amended claim 19, on the other hand, calls for a spring clip positioned within a transversely extending aperture of the housing. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 19.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 is also novel as a direct result of being dependent from amended claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 102 rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16, 17 and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowell (U.S. Pat. No. 1,182,170) in view of McNaughton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,086,118).

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19 to include a spring clip positioned in an aperture transversely extending through the housing. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rowell, McNaughton, nor their combination teach or suggest the connector or method of mounting a connector as defined in amended claims 1, 10 and 19. Specifically, Rowell and McNaughton disclose a clip that is positioned in an external groove. This clip then engages the bore to hold the housing in place inside the wall. The grooves of the cited references do not transversely extend through the housing. The Applicants' invention, on the other hand, involves a much different interaction between the spring clip and the housing. Instead of using a groove to attach the spring clip to the housing and subsequently sit it in the bore, the applicants' invention includes a transversely extending aperture through the housing so that the spring clip is positioned within the housing. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections to claims 1-7, 10-13, 16, 17 and 19-23 as being amended as stated or dependent from an amended claim.

Applicants have submitted new claims 41-44 for substantive examination. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references cited either alone or in combination with one another disclose, teach or suggest a connector having a retainer secured within a bore of a housing in combination with the other elements listed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass claims 41-44 to allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 18 and 25-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants present new claims that include the relevant subject matter of the objected claims. Specifically, new claims 29-37 correspond to the originally allowable claims. As such, Applicants respectfully request claims 29-37 to be allowed.

CONCLUSION

All of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If it is believed that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600. Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated July 7, 2004

By Donald G. Walker
Donald G. Walker – Reg. No. 44390
Attorneys for Applicants

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P. O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
Phone: 248/641-1600
Facsimile: 248/641-0270

DGW/rpp/jmm